DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 254 593 UD 024 109

TITLE	Schools and Communities as Partners. When Johnny Can't Read, Who Can Help?
INSTITUTION	Educational Priorities Panel, New York, N.Y.
PUB DATE	Feb 85
NOTE	77p.
PUB TYPE	Reports - Research/Technical (143)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC04 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	*Access to Education; Adult Education; Educational Finance; Elementary Secondary Education; *High Risk Students; *Institutional Cooperation; *Nontraditional Education; Private Agencies; *Program Effectiveness; Public Schools; *Remedial Programs; State School District Relationship; Truancy
IDENTIFIERS	City University of New York; Job Training Partnership Act 1982; *New York (New York); New York City Board of Education

ABSTRACT

This study examines the extent to which the New York City public school system enables high-risk students to gain access to the kinds of programs and services most appropriate for them. The report is limited to programs in alternative settings, including those operated by the Board of Education and those operated under private nonprofit auspices. Following a chapter on the funding of remedial education, the report discusses and describes services for older youth provided by three structures: (1) the Board of Education (dropout, basic skills, and general equivalency programs, alternative schools, outreach centers, and literacy centers); (2) City University colleges (student remedial programs, adult remedial programs, and (3) private nonprofit organizations (basic skills, life skills, literacy, dropout, and Job-Training-Partnership-Act programs). The report also identifies areas where better coordination would improve both students' access to appropriate programs and the quality of the services offered. A chapter on services for young students discusses truancy and remediation, the school volunteer program, and three examples of remedial programs that work. A major conclusion of the report is that the provision of better services for high-risk students is hindered by a lack of coordination among institutions "jealous of their turf and concerned about protecting their funding, their power, and their reputation." Recommendations are made for action to improve the situation at the Board and State levels, and for joint action by all involved parties. (CMG)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED024563

Schools

WHEN

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

✓ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

R. Willner

Educational Priorities Panel

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

ED024109

EDUCATIONAL
PRIORITIES
PANEL

The Educational Priorities Panel

251 Park Avenue South
New York, NY 10010
(212) 674-2121

Amina Abdur-Rahman, Coordinator

Advocates for Children
American Jewish Committee, New York Chapter
ASPIRA of New York
Association for the Help of Retarded Children
Center for Public Advocacy Research
Citizens' Committee for Children of New York, Inc.
The City Club of New York
Coalition of 100 Black Women
Community Council of Greater New York
Community Service Society
Council of Churches
The Junior League of Brooklyn
The Junior League of New York City, Inc.
League of Women Voters of New York City
Metropolitan Council of New York, NAACP
New York Urban Coalition
New York Urban League
Presbytery of New York
PROGRESO, Inc.
Public Education Association
Rheedlen Foundation
United Neighborhood Houses
United Parents Associations
Women's City Club of New York

Support for the Educational Priorities Panel for 1984-85 has been provided by:

Astor Foundation
Bankers Trust Company
Consolidated Edison of New York
Foundation for Child Development
Manufacturers Hanover Trust Company
Merrill Lynch & Company, Inc.
Metropolitan Life Foundation
Morgan Guaranty Trust Company
New York Community Trust
New York Foundation
New York Times Company Foundation, Inc
Rockefeller Brothers Fund
Helena Rubinstein Foundation
Scherman Foundation
Time Inc.

Management Staff - INTERFACE

251 Park Avenue South
New York, NY 10010
(212) 674-2121

Stanley Litow
David Lebenstein
Robin Willner
Susan Amlung
Jill Blair
Sandra Moore

BEST COPY

Schools and Communities as Partners

WHEN JOHNNY CAN'T READ, WHO CAN HELP?

Consultant: Lynne Weikart

February 1985

Amina Abdur-Rahman, Coordinator

EDUCATIONAL
PRIORITIES
PANEL

INTERFACE. Staff
251 Park Avenue South
New York NY 10010
(212) 674-2121

SCHOOLS & COMMUNITIES AS PARTNERS:
WHEN JOHNNY CAN'T READ, WHO CAN HELP?

CONTENTS

I.	Background & Overview	1
II.	Summary of Findings	9
III.	Recommendations	11
IV.	Financing Remedial Education	16
V.	Services for Older Youth	22
	A. Board of Education Programs	22
	B. CUNY: An Untapped Resource	38
	C. Community-Based Organizations: Resources Awaiting Recognition	44
	D. Literacy Assistance Center	48
	E. JTPA: Turf Fighting Between Agencies	49
VI.	Services for Young Students	53
	A. Truancy and Remediation	53
	B. School Volunteer Program	56
	C. Three Examples of Remedial Programs That Make A Difference	57
VII.	Conclusion	63

I. BACKGROUND AND OVERVIEW

Introduction

Many students who are having difficulty in school need different educational approaches and a wider range of suppport services than are usually provided in traditional school programs. This study seeks to uncover the extent to which the New York City public school system enables those students to have access to the kinds of programs and services that will best meet their needs and help them learn. Studies of successful remedial programs have shown that students who are failing in school are frequently alienated from the traditional school setting. Many also need a variety of non-academic services, ranging from personal and family counseling to part-time jobs and day care for children, that schools are rarely equipped to provide. The EPP believes that effective coordination with alternative programs and outside organizations can help meet these students' needs.

There are two ways that the school system can help youngsters who could benefit from nontraditional or "alternative" programs. It could develop links with outside agencies and community organizations that provide the services that youngsters need, and then develop an effective referral system that will direct students to the most appropriate providers. Or, it could use those same links to share expertise and learn about the successful approaches employed by outside agencies. Then, it could apply that knowledge to improve existing in-school remedial programs and to establish alternative programs within the public school system using the techniques that have proven effective elsewhere.

Both of these methods will benefit students. Both also require a willingness to work with outside organizations that, this study finds, is not often demonstrated by New York City public school administrators or teachers, or by state education officials and legislators who allocate the funds and formulate the regulations. As a result, many students are denied access to the programs and services that would help them succeed.

Background and Rationale for Study

The Board of Education of the City of New York provides remedial instruction for large numbers of students within its traditional school settings. It provides supplemental classroom instruction in reading and mathematics with categorical state and federal funds for approximately 110,000 students (12% of the total school population) identified by their scores on standardized statewide examinations. Additional assistance is received by 18,000 students who are held over to repeat the fourth or seventh grade, and by another 12,000 entering-high-school students who do not perform up to standards.

For many students, these approaches are adequate; for others they are not. Last year, 32,000 youngsters dropped out of school before completion. Studies show that most of them have experienced repeated failure, have failed to amass the academic credits expected of their age group, and despair of ever being able to graduate.(1) Academic failure is closely correlated with dropping out. In fact, in the class of 1978, "almost 100 percent of the students who were

---

1. Eileen Foley and Peggy Crull, Educating the At-Risk Adolescent, Public Education Association, 1984.

below grade level on standardized math and reading tests by a combined total of more than seven years dropped out of school."(1) Just as important as their academic failures, students who drop out exhibit a deep sense of alienation from the traditional school community, as demonstrated by their failure to make social connections within the school environment.(2)

For such high-risk youngsters, different approaches are needed. The public schools can and should adopt some of these nontraditional methods. However, in some cases, alternative settings have certain inherent advantages over standard school settings. For example, studies of some alternative schools and community-based programs have shown that removing the student from the school building has definite salutary effects. These settings are free of negative associations for the student, particularly important for older students and dropouts. Alternative programs provide small, supportive environments where students can develop close personal relationships with staff and with other students who share common problems. Community-based nonprofit organizations, especially, have greater community acceptance and are more closely linked to the youngster's home life, often employing local residents as instructional staff. The instructors also have more flexible hours than school-based teachers do, so they can make home visits or hold evening sessions. A major federal pilot project, linking school attendance and jobs

---

1. New York Public Schools, "The Dropout Reports," October 16, 1979

2. Foley, op. cit.

for high-risk teen-agers, concluded that the availability of alternative educational programs accounted for most of the increase in return-to-school rates accomplished by the project.(1)

Furthermore, as employment training experts specializing in high-risk youth have learned, any single approach is rarely sufficient. Highly disadvantaged youngsters have a range of needs, including academic remediation and basic literacy instruction; work readiness training and work experience; individual and family counseling; and concrete services such as housing, medical attention, day care, and even cash stipends. The schools can meet some of these needs; others are better addressed by other agencies. The key is to bring all the appropriate resources to bear in a coordinated fashion to meet the individual needs of each child. Success in job training programs, such as those conducted under the Federal Youth Employment Demonstrations Project Act, has depended upon the range of services that can be linked together and coordinated according to the needs of particular youngsters.(2)

School systems can and must do much more to apply the lessons from successful alternative programs to their remedial efforts. There is a great deal of room for improvement in school-based remedial programs if the schools are ever to fulfill their basic mission to enable all children to learn. However, in some cases, a bureaucracy such as the New York City Board of Education does not have the flexibility to

---

1. Manpower Demonstration Research Corporation, "Findings on the YIEPP Demonstration," April 1983.

2. Lefkowitz, Bernard, Jobs for Youth: What We Have Learned, Edna M. Clark Foundation, 1982.

tailor individualized programs, nor are they equipped to provide an adequate range of social services to meet the extraordinary needs of some students. However, as this report will show, there are community groups and other institutions in New York City that have the capacity to provide many of these services. Though not universally of high quality, some of these programs have demonstrated marked success with high-risk youngsters. By working closely with them, the public schools can take advantage of additional opportunities to meet students needs. The Board must view alternative programs as partners in a common cause, not competitors for funds. Instead of spending energy resisting the encroachments of other organizations, school officials should be facilitating cooperation with them. Ironically, there are also successful alternative programs within the school system, but these too are not well coordinated with mainstream educational programs.

Also, just as outside agencies can be important resources for schools, the school system has invaluable assets that it can make available to the community. Foremost among these assets are the school buildings themselves. Although ideally structured and equipped for youngsters' use, this resource goes largely unused during non-school hours, and schools remain insulated from their surrounding communities. The Board of Education must see its school buildings as potential centers of community educational activities, and must substantially increase community access to its facilities.

When close working relationships are developed, students can receive the services most appropriate for them from those providers who are best equipped to serve them. However, this ideal situation rarely occurs. This study originally sought to identify the barriers to such cooperation and propose ways of overcoming them. In fact, the report does reveal some obstacles to cooperation in restrictive funding or regulatory requirements, and others that emerge from personnel and credential issues. What it also finds, however, is that these obstacles are easily surmountable if the will to do so exists. The real problem lies in the fact that institutions are jealous of their turf and concerned about protecting their funding, their power, and their reputations. Even where funding is shared, as in the case of City University-sponsored remedial programs, there is little if any programmatic cooperation. Obviously, fiscal incentives and eased regulations can help, but only if the goal of coordination has been accepted.

This report will also describe some models of successful alternative programs, and will demonstrate that funding for educational remediation need not be limited to traditional school systems.

Of course, community-based organizations cannot replace in-school programs; they are meant as a supplement. Nor does their existence relieve the schools of their basic responsibility to educate all our children. While some fear that difficult-to-educate children will be pushed out of the public school system if viable alternatives exist, this need not be the case and every precaution must be taken to guard against such an abdication of responsibility. Finally, the development of an alternative system must not be an excuse for government

to siphon off funds from the public schools. Each serves an important need, and each must be supported.

A few examples of close coordination between schools and outside agencies do exist and some mechanisms for financing such cooperation are in place. This study seeks to encourage policy makers on the state and local levels to expand these efforts and to explore further alternatives to the current ways of funding and administering remedial programs, so that children may have full access to the services most appropriate for them.

It should be noted that the report is limited to programs in alternative settings, including those operated by the Board of Education and those operated under private nonprofit auspices; it does not deal with traditional in-school remedial programs. Furthermore, the researcher made no attempt to evaluate individual programs independently. The programs are described for illustrative purposes only, although they all enjoy excellent reputations within the field as documented by the assessment data reported in the case studies.

A study of alternative programs for remedial skills training is important because participation in today's workforce requires literacy. Service jobs, to a much greater extent than factory jobs, call for good oral and written skills, and a high-quality secondary education is generally the minimum prerequisite, virtually eliminating high school dropouts. A recent survey found that only 18 percent of all jobs were open to those without a high school diploma.(1)

---

1. Gordon Berlin and Joanne Duhl, "Education, Equity and Economic Excellence: The Critical Role of Second Chance Basic Skills and Job Training Programs," unpublished paper, Ford Foundation, August 30, 1984.

Yet, the drop-out rate in New York City hovers around 40 percent. Often minority youngsters, high school dropouts are likely to remain only intermittently employed throughout their lifetimes. The cost in human and financial terms is enormous. The effective use of remediation resources is an issue that must concern not only the schools, but also society at large.

BEST COPY

II. SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

1. The Board of Education has restricted the growth of alternative programs and has impeded links to community-based organizations. For example:

- Outreach and Literacy Centers, important avenues for retaining high-risk youngsters, have received little recognition or financial support. New literacy and remedial funds have been designated for use within the high schools rather than for these alternative programs (pp. 33-38);
- Only three of the programs launched with new state attendance funds have included outside agencies: two district programs and one at the high school level. At least one of these agencies has been required to use Board personnel (pp. 47, 55);
- Rental fees and high custodial fees prevent community organizations from using school buildings for after-school programs (pp. 53-62);
- Only students who have been discharged from school may take Adult and Continuing Education (ACE) high school equivalency courses. This means that students wishing to obtain a diploma through ACE must drop out of school, thus limiting their ability to return to regular high school if they so desire (pp. 23, 30).

2. The vast majority of funds for remediation is restricted to the Board of Education. Even some state programs for adults over 21 and welfare recipients are conducted by the Board. City colleges offering GED programs must subcontract with the Board and use Board personnel in order to get federal funds.

The notable exceptions are: the Federal Adult Education Act, which allows states to designate nonprofit recipients; the federal Job Training Partnership Act; and the city's new funds (from the MAC surplus) for literacy programs. The latter is a model for cooperative funding, since local funds are combined with state-administered AEA funds, to reduce paperwork and reporting requirements (pp. 16-20).

3. Recent changes in state regulations have made high school equivalency programs potentially more effective. In-school programs will be open to 16-year-olds who need not officially drop out of school first. The programs must provide support services and students will be allowed to take the examination more readily. However, students cannot accumulate regular academic credits in equivalency programs, thus discouraging them from returning to school (pp. 30-32).

4. The six Outreach Centers sponsored by the Board of Education, originally envisioned as time-limited transition programs for students returning to regular high schools, have become successful alternatives to the regular system because of the intensive support services they offer. However, they are unfairly and inadequately funded, they have not been expanded, and their status is diminished by their staff's lack of equivalent titles within the

school system. Similarly, two literacy centers for students with little or no reading skills, a population that is severely underserved, have been denied adequate funding, while new funds for literacy programs have been designated for use within traditional school-based programs (pp. 33-36).

5. Judged by student completion rates, Board of Education remedial programs for those with the lowest-level skills, though more widespread, are not as successful as programs run by CUNY or community-based organizations. However, Board-sponsored GED programs serve more students and are more successful than others (pp. 24-30).

6. CUNY is a leader in developing curricula and assessment techniques for its basic skills programs for incoming freshmen. CUNY also has had a great deal of success with its continuing education programs and learning centers providing both basic skills and English as a Second Language courses as well as GED and noncredit courses. However, despite the fact that the colleges must subcontract with Board of Education for their high school equivalency programs, there is no formal structure for CUNY and the Board to share expertise or staff development and no financing mechanism exists to fund such collaboration. Funding for CUNY's learning centers is piecemeal since there is a great deal of opposition to colleges sharing funds which traditionally have gone to local education agencies and their personnel (pp. 38-44).

7. Of the 18 community-based organizations that receive state funds for basic skills instruction, at least 15 have higher success rates than the Board of Education. Their advantages include: small size; flexible staffing; their own curricula; and flexible hours (pp. 44-48).

8. Very few community-based remedial programs have any formal ties with the Board, other than operating after-school programs (pp. 56-63).

9. The Job Training Partnership Act, CETA's replacement, earmarks eight percent of its funding for basic skills training. The employment training is administered by the State Department of Labor through the local Department of Employment. The local DOE also controls the education component contracts, but these are administered by the State Department of Education. The numerous administrative layers for JTPA have resulted in disastrous conflicts and delays so that cooperation between employment training and education providers has been severely impaired (pp. 49-52).

10. Chronic truancy, often the first sign of a student in academic trouble, is not systematically tracked by the school system. Approximately 140,000 students are absent daily. Resources for addressing chronic truancy have been drastically reduced. At the present time there is no central policy or plan to establish a comprehensive attendance program that fits truants' needs, while the Bureau of Attendance is being dismantled (pp. 53-56).

11. There are relatively few comprehensive remedial programs for younger students compared to those for teen-agers, and financing for such programs is scarce (pp.55-56).

III. RECOMMENDATIONS

Overall Recommendation

With the large numbers of students who are failing despite traditional remedial efforts, school officials and government officials who set education funding policy must broaden their outlook to embrace more fully the alternative settings and innovative approaches such as the ones described in this report. They must make every effort to increase students' access to the variety of services that will best meet their needs, and to refer students to appropriate programs. Such a policy can be implemented at various levels and by different agencies in several specific ways described below:

Board of Education Action

1. The Board of Education should expand its High School Equivalency programs to take advantage of new state regulations allowing 16 year-olds to take enriched GED courses without being discharged from school. Students should have full access to these programs as an alternative to dropping out.

2. The Board of Education should increase programming for young people with low-level reading skills. Literacy Centers should be linked to the Outreach Centers to increase these students' options. The Literacy Assistance Center should direct the involvement of the Literacy Centers in the development of literacy programs within the high schools.

3. Outreach Centers have established a good track record, but their funding and supervisory system need to be upgraded in order to become legitimate in their colleagues' views and to attract and hold good staff. Teachers who are in charge of centers should be promoted to assistant principals. Outreach Centers need a per capita funding formula that provides adequate levels of support for the special needs and varying enrollments of their students.

4. Truancy among younger students is one of the first indicators of academic trouble. A central Board of Education policy must be established to govern a comprehensive attendance program that fits truants' needs. The present information system can and should be modified to collect centrally individual attendance data, which already exist at the classroom level. School attendance programs should be coordinated with community organizations.

5. School facilities must be made more widely available to community groups for after-school and remedial programs. Joint efforts between communities and schools can work only if the Board of Education sets a strong policy to that effect and demonstrates its willingness by opening the schools after 3 PM and increasing district allocations to encourage experimentation. Agreement with custodians to reduce school opening fees must be sought and additional funds from the city and state should be pursued to accomplish these purposes.

6. The school system should target funds (perhaps including the new state attendance improvement funds) and provide assistance to replicate in several school districts the community/school model

of Grand Academy in CSD 1. For a pilot program, funds should be added to Module 5, and one community school district in each borough willing to experiment with agency linkages should be chosen through a competitive proposal process.

State Action

7. Public colleges and community-based organizations should be made eligible for State Employment Preparation Education (EPE) funds. The EPE program is a basic skills program for those over 21, an area where both the CBOs and CUNY have demonstrated success. Similarly, the state Welfare Education Program, which allocates $1 million to the Board of Education to provide remedial education to adults on welfare, need not be restricted to the Board.

8. A funding mechanism should be created for CUNY's learning centers, which have demonstrated their potential for serving a needy population. The first step is the funding of pilot comprehensive learning centers throughout the state at both the secondary and higher education levels. This new central funding should include the financing of counseling services to enable students to link with other kinds of services such as job training and development programs, and the financing of administrative support.

9. State regulations should be amended to allow students in High School Equivalency Programs to earn partial credit for academic courses, thus enabling them to return to high school more easily.

10. The few experiments with state and city joint funding and joint reporting that now exist must continue and expand. The cooperation between the State Education Department's Division of Adult and Continuing Education and the city's literacy programs has just begun through the merging of Adult Education funds and the MAC surplus. Other agencies involved in literacy programs such as the Division of Social Services and the Department of Employment need to join the experiment.

11. The rapid growth in literacy programs requires a state and local emphasis on program accountability. Proof must be sought that literacy programs, regardless of their curriculum or teaching staffs, are providing quality instruction. Common student assessment instruments for students entering and leaving the programs would allow for better comparability and monitoring.

Joint Action

12. The Board of Education and CUNY should define ways to work together on staff development in remediation, an area in which CUNY has developed vast expertise from which the Board can benefit.

Three methods are possible: joint funding; earmarking of new school staff development funds for CUNY colleges; or using the Literacy Assistance Center as the link in staff development between the two institutions.

13. Programs under the Job Training Partnership Act are difficult to administer. The Department of Employment should, at the least, limit its paperwork by modifying its information system and ceasing

the recertification of JTPA participants referred by other agencies where they have already been certified as JTPA-eligible. One state agency should administer the programs. DOE should consider lengthening its six-month training cycle, which severely limits remedial efforts.

14. A redesign of the federal Summer Youth Employment Program combining summer jobs and remediation for high-risk youth has been proposed by the Ford Foundation. Such a program would allow entering high school students to earn a wage while improving their basic skills, and give them an incentive to stay in school. It should be tried.

IV. FINANCING REMEDIAL EDUCATION

The formal and implied requirements of funding often tend to shape educational programs. The legislative and regulatory restrictions as well as the implicit incentives in reimbursement patterns determine the amount of creativity and flexibility allowed in programming.

In order to understand the problems of coordination among remedial programs, therefore, it is important to be aware of their funding streams.

Adult Education Act (AEA)

In FY 1984 New York State received $6.5 million under the Federal Adult Education Act (AEA). These funds are the principal source of support for basic education in NYS for those who are 16 or over and out of school. The purpose of the funds is to enable adults to continue their education and become more employable and more productive. The major concentration of funds is for adults with less than a 9th grade reading and math ability and for non-English speaking adults.

Until 1979 AEA funded only programs offered by local school districts. An amendment to the Act in 1979 sponsored by Senator Jacob Javits extended eligibility to other agencies to operate adult basic education instructional programs if states permitted. New York was one of the few states to take advantage of the Javits amendment. In FY 1983-84, 24 organizations, including the Board of

Education and CUNY colleges, received AEA funding totalling $2.76 million. (See Appendix for complete listing.)

Welfare Education Program (WEP)

In FY 1983-84 New York State provided $4.46 million for basic education for those on public assistance. Half of this money is designated for New York City. These funds, which are limited to school systems only, are combined annually with the AEA program.

High School Equivalency

In FY 1984 New York State provided $1.9 million in categorical monies to local school districts for high school equivalency programs. Of this, more than $900,000 were allocated to the NYC Board of Education. These programs are limited to students who are at least 16 years of age and reading on at least the 7th grade level. In 1979, four community colleges sub-contracted with the Board and offered a high school equivalency program, commonly called GED or General Education Degree. This grew to seven colleges in 1983-84. While the colleges must use Board personnel, the colleges formulate the policy governing these programs. For the 1984-85 school year, high school equivalency funds for those under 21 years of age became part of the general school operating aid formula. This change permits the funds to grow every year as the registers increase. For those over 21, a new program was created. (See below.)

Employment Preparation Education Act (EPE)

In FY 1984-85 New York State created a new formula aid to provide $5.8 million for adult (21+) education programs. This newly created funding would use state funds for adult basic skill education similar to the federal Adult Education Act. However, unlike the federal funds, these state dollars can be used only by school districts. The Board of Education will receive $2.21 million in these dollars.

Refugee Assistance Program (RAP)

This state program is designed to help refugees on public assistance to become self-sufficient. RAP includes an English language training program for which several community-based organizations and CUNY colleges receive funding. While small, the program offers four levels of English as a Second Language (ESL) throughout the state. Often the program is conducted side by side with the ESL component of the AEA program. RAP is administered by the NYS Department of Social Services which awards contracts to those CBOs, the Board of Education and CUNY colleges that wish to conduct RAP classes. In FY 1983-84, New York State provided $0.75 million for RAP. New York City's share was $320,000.

Job Training Partnership Act (JTPA)

This federal Act is a replacement for CETA and provides job training for youth and unskilled adults. Within each state's allocation, 8% of the funds are for educational programs. The importance of the education components was demonstrated by the federal youth employment projects which linked remedial education

and work experience. This part of JTPA has become known as the "8% Basic Skills" component and is administered jointly by the New York State Education Department and New York City's Department of Employment. Currently 15 New York City organizations, including the Board of Education, are under contract to deliver basic skills training to youth 16 years and older. $3.6 million is designated for the 8% Basic Skills program in New York City.

MAC Surplus

A surplus from the city Municipal Assistance Corporation funds this year resulted in a new city-funded literacy program, with $7.5 million being set aside this year and $35 million planned over the next four years. This funding was largely a result of the work of the Mayor's office and the Literacy Task Force which demonstrated the extent of illiteracy in this city. The funding has been divided among several groups: $1 million to CUNY, $1 million to CBOs, $3 million to the Board of Education, $2 million to the public libraries, and $.5 million to the Literacy Assistance Center. (A list of recipients is included in the Appendix.) The funds were combined with the state-administered Adult Education funds to reduce reporting requirements.

Totals

The total amount of city, state and federal funding for remedial skills programs is summarized by the following chart.

BASIC SKILLS, ESL AND GED FUNDING *

New York State and Local Share
(in millions of dollars)

	Funding Source	New York State		New York City	
		FY '83-84	FY '84-85	FY '83-84	FY '84-85
1.	ABE	$6.50	$6.50	$2.76	$2.76
2.	WEP†	2.00	4.46	1.00	2.23
3.	HSE†	1.94	None	0.98	None
4.	EPE†	None	5.80 **	None	2.21 **
5.	RAP	0.75	0.75	0.32	0.32
6.	JTPA	6.40	7.90	2.90	3.60
7.	MAC	None	None	None	7.50
	TOTALS	$17.59	$25.41	$7.96	$18.62

* Data obtained from SED Department of Finance.

† Restricted to the local education agency.

** Estimate.

Additional Funding for Remediation

An additional potential funding source for certain remedial programs was passed this spring in the State Legislature. The program, Attendance Improvement and Retention, sponsored by Assemblyman Jose Serrano, is to identify students at risk of becoming truants and to promote their retention in school. Technically, these funds are not for remedial programs. However, attendance improvement and remediation are intertwined in good programming. Over $27 million was made available to the state; $22 million of that came to the New York City schools.

In-school remediation has also been funded by the federal and state governments for many years through two major funding sources: Chapter I of the federal Education Consolidation Improvement Act (ECIA) and the Pupils with Special Educational Needs (PSEN) weighting in the state operating aid formula.

Chapter I funds (formerly Title I of the Elementary, and Secondary Education Act) are targeted for educationally and economically disadvantaged children. In 1984, New York City received $192 million in Chapter I funds, $5 million less than the year before.

PSEN aid is directed for students reading below a statewide reference point on the PEP tests administered in the third and sixth grades. PSEN funds for New York City in 1984 totaled $96.7 million.

Both of these funding streams support supplemental classroom services within the traditional school setting, and are not therefore, a part of this study.

V. SERVICES FOR OLDER YOUTHS

Myriad remedial programs for youths 16 years of age and older exist in New York City. In general, each is sponsored by one of three structures: the Board of Education; a City University college; or a private nonprofit organization. Although they all serve a similar population and offer similar services, there is little interchange among the three structures. In fact, there is competition among them for students and funds. Each sponsor has its strengths and weaknesses, but there is little sharing of expertise and almost no joint development of curricula and materials. Even worse, students must find appropriate programs by chance, since there is no referral system to help them enroll in the program best suited to their needs.

This section describes the programs offered by these three structures and identifies areas where better coordination would improve students' access to appropriate programs as well as the quality of the services offered.

A. Board of Education Programs

Dropouts

The school system provides remedial instruction on an ongoing basis. Students who wish to leave the regular programs but remain in the public schools may enroll in alternative schools that are oriented to high risk students or may enroll in GED programs sponsored by Auxiliary Services in the High Schools (ASHS). Under new state regulations, high schools may offer high school equivalency programs

for 16 to 18 year-olds. These programs require more instructional hours than regular GED programs, and must offer support services.

Students who do not benefit from traditional in-school remedial programs often drop out of school. If they do so after reaching 16 years of age, they are eligible to enroll in adult education programs, run by the Division of Adult and Continuing Education (ACE) (either in English as a Second Language (ESL) classes, basic skills classes for those with low reading levels, or the more advanced GED programs), or those programs offered by community-based organizations. Students who have accumulated few high school credits and have little chance to obtain all the required credits for a high school diploma often enroll in one of the Continuing Education programs that lead to a GED.

Unlike the in-school GED programs, the ACE programs at this time are limited to students who are at least 17 and discharged from school for one year. These requirements limit the options of students who do not wish to be officially labelled as dropouts, and make it very difficult for students in GED programs to return to high school if they so desire.

ACE programs are available at various levels of attainment. Classes are provided throughout the city both day and evening, and all instructional classes are free. The programs are limited to academics. Other needs such as job training and job development are not, except in a few cases, addressed, and there is no system of referral to other programs that might provide these services.

Basic Skills Programs

The quality of the Board of Education's remedial courses varies throughout the city. When compared to CBOs and CUNY colleges, the Board of Education is particularly weak in ESL and basic literacy courses. However, it is difficult to compare a broad-based school program to small community-based organizations. First unlike other programs, Board of Education adult and continuing educational programs are spread throughout the city in every neighborhood. Second, young adults who enroll in basic literacy or ESL programs found on college campuses could be the more ambitious students while less motivated students may enroll in neighborhood Board-sponsored programs. Yet these differences do not entirely explain the difference in the quality of the programs. Over the years community-based organizations and CUNY colleges have created strong programs particularly in the areas of basic skills and ESL.

When comparisons are made among the Board of Education programs, CBOs and CUNY, the Board does not fare as well in beginning courses. (GED programs are discussed in the next section.) The specific statistics are listed in Appendix A and summarized below. In the ESL and literacy programs, at least 15 agencies do better than the Board programs. At the middle level, for students who start with a fifth grade reading level, the Board's success rate is average compared to other programs.

Students' Success Rates

	All AEA Programs		Board of Ed		BOE Rank Among
	# Sts.	% Completing	# Sts.	% Completing	All Programs
1. ESL	4,054	43.85%	2,604	39.69%	16 out of 18
2. Basic Literacy 0 to 4.9 grade	1,117	36.64%	545	29.86%	17 out of 19
3. Middle Level 5 to 8.9 grade	3,374	28.09%	2,597	27.94%	9 out of 18

* See Appendix A.
* SED Data 1982-83. Success is measured as the number of students who completed the specifically designed level within the categories, ESL, Basic Literacy and

The Board of Education has much to learn from the success of the others in the basic skills programs. Unfortunately, in the past there has been little interchange among CBOs, CUNY colleges and staff involved in these programs. However, with the major infusion of MAC funds this year, serious attempts are being made to link staff among these institutions. The Literacy Assistance Center, an independent nonprofit technical assistance organization (see p. 50), has agreed to provide staff development workshops for all teachers of literacy, regardless of their institution.

There must of course be guarantees that, regardless of the institution that is providing the remediation, there is accountability that the programs offered are of high quality. A good beginning has been the work of the State's Division of Adult and Continuing Education which has established a small but easy-to-read data base that permits the kinds of comparison drawn in this study. The next step is a more comprehensive student assessment system to diagnose participants' needs, so that the students can receive appropriate services. A common assessment system to replace the current plethora of tests would also allow for more comparability among programs. One comprehensive student assessment system is fully operational in California and is being field tested in five other states. Accountability is important, and certainly, with the expansion of literacy programs in the city, it is time these types of assessments were considered.

General Equivalency Programs

As mentioned, the Board of Education offers several levels of remediation training ranging from basic skills and ESL, through pre-

GED and GED preparation. It has a great deal of experience in operating GED programs in particular. These programs have been offered by Adult and Continuing Education (ACE) since 1973 for out-of-school youths, and by Auxiliary Services for High School since 1969 for in-school youths. High school equivalency programs are offered at more than 100 sites throughout the city. In addition, the Board oversees high school equivalency programs at CUNY, since the state High School Equivalency funds are reserved for the Board which subcontracts with CUNY. Some community colleges charge a fee for the GED program and receive no Board funds for the program.*

The original GED programs in the United States were created during World War II for young people whose education had been disrupted by national service. Nationwide, over 500,000 people obtain diplomas annually through a GED program. The national GED test battery consists of five tests: Writing Skills, Science, Social Studies, Reading Skills and Mathematics. If a person fails any or all parts of the exam, he/she can take any part again. The New York State Education Department establishes eligibility requirements, minimum test scores, and administers the test. In New York State, 89,000 people took the exam in 1982; over half of them from New York City.

Auxiliary Services for High School (ASHS) offers a way for students who cannot attend regular day high school to complete their education without having to be officially discharged. ASHS offers

---

* These programs are not included in our data base.

several programs at 13 sites, with at least two in every borough except the Bronx, which has only one site. Its GED programs are in English and Spanish, providing up to 150 hours of instruction, mostly in three-hour evening segments.

CUNY also offers GED programs either through a fee-based program or a free program paid for by Adult Education funds given to the Board of Education. (See pp. 38-44 for a full description of CUNY remedial programs.) Students 16 and older can obtain a diploma free by enrolling in one of eleven colleges that sub-contract with the Board. These programs have been offered free since 1980, when the Board agreed, at the City Council President's urging, to share its high school equivalency funds with CUNY. CUNY offers a substantially different and more limited program than the Board's at lower costs.

CUNY's program is a continuous enrollment system that is 8 weeks long in duration with a two-week recruitment period. The program runs three hours a night for two nights a week. It is short-term and limits instruction to only the necessary hours and curriculum needed to pass the GED or part of the GED for a particular student. This means that far fewer instructional hours are offered. In 1982-83 CUNY's instruction hours totaled 5,994 while the Board of Education offered 29,406 hours. This also means that the GED cost at CUNY is less, as demonstrated by the following chart.

Comparative Costs of GED Programs*

	Amount of Grant	Number of Diplomas	Cost per Diploma
BOE	$814,584	3,483	$234
CUNY	166,940	2,455	68

* Calculated from 1982-83 data in letter dated October 20, 1983, from Neil Carr, State Education Department, to Rada Milentiyivic, CUNY, and from BOE, Office of Adult and Continuing Education data.

The BOE has a much broader program - literally averaging 100 to 150 hours of instruction as compared to a limited prescribed amount to each GED student enrolled at CUNY. It is of primary importance that CUNY explore the degree to which the limited number of instructional hours may be affecting the number of their students who pass the GED exam.

Both programs assess students, enroll them in course work and then refer those deemed qualified to the GED exam. In contrast to the Board of Education's lag at the ESL and basic literacy level, the Board demonstrates as strong a program or stronger than CUNY at the GED level. In the following chart, the higher enrollment rate indicates that the Board permits more students into its GED program, and the greater percent of enrolled to referred indicates that the Board also refers more students to the exam. Finally, the chart shows that in 1982-83, the BOE students had a better success rate, even though the BOE was less selective in referring students to the exam.

In total the Board enrolled more than 8,000 students and referred 59 percent of them to the exam. Of these 71 percent passed. In contrast, CUNY enrolled fewer than 7,000 students, referred almost the same percent (58) of them to the exam, and had a 62 percent passing rate. On every grade level except the lowest, the BOE consistently referred a larger portion of its enrollees to the exam and it had a higher success rate for every grade level.

One important note: if Kingsborough Community College's GED program were included in CUNY's statistics, CUNY's success rate would be similar to the BOE's. However, Kingsborough no longer sub-contracts with the BOE, and now offers only a fee-based program.

Comparative GED Enrollment, Referral, and Passing Rates for CUNY and BOE

	CUNY	BOE
Reading level 7-8.9		
# Students enrolled	3,594	4,200
# Students referred to exam	2,030	2,144
Percent referred to exam	56%	51%
# Students passing exam	907	1,174
Percent of those referred passing exam	45%	55%
Reading level 9-9.9		
# Students enrolled	1,237	2,237
# Students referred to exam	655	1,501
Percent referred to exam	53%	67%
# Students passing exam	421	1,218
Percent of those referred passing exam	64%	81%
Reading level 10-10.9		
# Students enrolled	993	919
# Students referred to exam	576	592
Percent referred to exam	58%	64%
# Students passing exam	460	487
Percent of those referred passing exam	80%	82%
Reading 11+		
# Students enrolled	1,088	876
# Students referred to exam	720	641
Percent referred to exam	66%	73%
# Students passing exam	667	604
Percent of those referred passing exam	93%	94%
Totals		
All enrolled	6,912	8,232
All referred to exam	3,981	4,878
Percent referred to exam	58%	59%
Students passing exam	2,455	3,483
Percent of those referred passing exam	62%	71%

Note: BOE Data 1982-83 taken from statistical collection of all GED programs offered by the BOE.

YUS-1/5

It is clear that the Board and CUNY can learn from one another. CUNY ought to examine the Board's programs for possible upgrading of its own GED programs, while the Board ought to examine CUNY's assessment techniques which produce such a cost-effective targeted program.

The GED program, whether CUNY's or the Board's, offers an important service to thousands of students in the city. Yet, students who do not want to drop out of school are seriously limited in their choice of a GED program. If they have reached 17 years of age, they must be discharged before they can enroll in Adult and Continuing Education or CUNY programs, which are very numerous and located throughout the city. If students wish to remain in school, they are currently limited to one of the 13 programs offered by ASHS or those in-school programs now being developed under the new state regulations.

The discharged status has several disadvantages:

1. It labels the student as a dropout even if that student enrolls in a GED program. The discharged status labels the student a failure and ignores the mobility of some students who, because of personal reasons, choose to leave school and then return, not to their old high school, but to a neighborhood program they have heard about. Since the program is operated by Adult and Continuing Education, that student remains in the discharged category.

2. Requiring the students to drop out first creates a crack for that student to fall into. There is a lagtime between discharge and enrollment in Adult and Continuing Education courses, during which the system may lose the student entirely.

Countering the argument that students should be permitted to transfer to adult and continuing educational programs without being discharged is the fear that principals will drive poor students out of their schools and into GED programs. Of course, schools must

continue their remediation efforts and strive to meet these student's needs. Transfers should be monitored so that schools which seem to have excessive transfers could be closely watched. But this potential abuse should not deter permitting students more alternatives. In addition, the evidence is that the existence of alternatives does not increase "push-outs." The Outreach Centers have not received increased referrals from the high schools in the past two years (see pages 33-36).

On the plus side, the state's regulations for in-school GED programs for 16 to 18 year-olds have recently been revised to make the program more effective and more accessible:

1. Students may now enter GED programs at age 16, rather than having to wait until they are 17;
2. Programs for alternative high school equivalency programs can be financed by the Serrano funds;
3. Programs must provide supplemental services as well as an academic program;
4. Students can take the GED when they demonstrate readiness.

These amendments provide opportunities that have not previously existed. Students who are hopelessly behind in the accumulation of credit needed for graduation now have an alternative. They may move into a GED program more quickly, and they will receive more than just instruction.

However, the drawback still remains that students are not easily able to return to the regular high school for a regular diploma. If they are 17, they must still be discharged first, and they do not accumulate academic credits in a GED program. If the regulations were amended so that students could receive some credit in the

equivalency program, they would have the option of returning to a regular high school without an inordinate loss of time. There is precedent for this since students in high school may now earn up to a total of two elective credits for remedial courses. The Regents Action Plan has also provided a mechanism for students to earn up to six and a half credits by establishing competency through a test.

Alternative Programs

As the school system has sought to respond to an increasing number of students dropping out of school, alternative programs within the school system have been created to meet the needs of students who no longer can tolerate the traditional high school setting. According to a recent PEA study of alternative high schools,[1] students performed better in the alternative schools than they had in their previous schools, despite the alternative schools' depressing physical plants and lack of resources. With the appointment of a Superintendent of Alternative Schools, these high schools have had an advocate in the system. Outreach Centers and Literacy Centers, especially, have always had a separate and unequal status and require this same opportunity to upgrade their standing. A major barrier to the effective coordination of these alternative programs with the school system is that they are denied adequate funding and status within the system. The Board currently resists alternative settings and prefers to put its resources into the large high schools. Yet the alternative programs demonstrate success where the regular high schools fail.

---

[1] Eileen Foley, "Educating the At-Risk Adolescent," Public Education Association, 1984.

Outreach Centers

Outreach Centers, established in 1979, provide a wider range of educational and support services to dropouts (16-21) than the programs offered by ASHS. Outreach Centers were originally viewed as a temporary placement to help adolescents return to the educational system. The uniqueness of the Outreach Centers lies in their approach to the students' needs through intensive guidance and remediation (see Women's City Club Report "A Survey of Six Outreach Centers"). The program is not simply a class in an evening high school where a student prepares for an exam; rather, it includes an intensive intake procedure and individual and group counseling so that students can understand their problems and strengthen their attendance and education. The Centers are permitted to keep students for only a year and then must seek their placement in an appropriate learning environment. However, they have quickly become an alternative to the regular high school system. Students do not wish to leave. What was originally conceived as useful to students returning to the system -- intensive counseling, part-time employment opportunities and child care facilities -- has now become a genuine alternative to a large impersonal high school where the student does not experience adequate support.

The Outreach Centers have been quite successful. The 1983 Women's City Club study reported that, of the 9,220 students served by the centers since their inception, over 6,800 have been placed in other programs or received a degree. In 1983-84, almost 4,320 students passed through the gates of the Outreach Centers. Of these, 545 were referred to other programs, 899 were placed in high

schools, 312 graduated, 748 were discharged without a degree and 1,812 are on register this fall. While the average daily attendance ranges from 33 to 70 percent at the various centers, the average is 52 percent. Considering that Outreach Centers deal with the most difficult population, these statistics are impressive. When the Outreach Centers originally began some feared that high school principals would refer poor students to them. This has not occurred. Most students who came into the Outreach Centers are not referred by their high schools. What has occurred, instead, is that hundreds of students are attracted back to school through the Outreach Centers, and then returned to the high schools.

In 1981, at the Chancellor's request, Bank Street College evaluated the Outreach Center program, and reported that the Centers were quite successful in bringing adolescents back to school and keeping them in school or at the Center. Over 55 percent of the students sampled remained in their first placement site and another 17% remained in the second placement.[2]

While several reports and certainly current statistics demonstrate the success of Outreach Centers as an important alternative in remedial education, it is obvious that the BOE does not accord the Outreach Centers much significance. Within the Board, the Outreach Center Program is denied the status required to survive in the bureaucracy. Although the Centers have existed since 1979, their heads have not been designated assistant principals. While

---

2 Bank Street College of Education Evaluation Team, "1980-81 Program Evaluation of the Adolescent Outreach Program."

such personnel problems may not seem major, the lack of official recognition can prevent the Outreach Centers from being an accepted part of the educational system. Without administrators or appropriate status to speak for them, the Centers are ignored in many high school meetings, and often have no representation at all. Without adequate advancement within the Outreach Centers, staff tend to gain experience in the Outreach Centers and then go on to regular high schools where they can obtain benefits and proper certification.

As another indication of the neglect suffered by the Outreach Centers, the funds from the state attendance and retention improvement programs were not allocated to them. There has been no expansion of the Outreach Centers at a time when Board of Education should be looking for successful alternative programs to expand and replicate with the new funds. Although the Board allocated $8.4 million of the Serrano funds to the Division of High Schools, none of the funds were designated for an expansion of Outreach Centers, despite their excellent track record. Over $3 million alone was designated for the PREP program within regular high schools, a program which the EPP has severely criticized. This decision clearly demonstrates the bias of the present administration in favor of traditional high schools over alternatives. It is important, if more funds are going to be committed to PREP, that the EPP's critique be seriously examined and the problems with PREP corrected.

Most important, Outreach Centers are inadequately and unfairly funded. First, unlike other high schools, they are not funded on a formula basis. For other high schools, the funding formula self-

adjusts each semester as enrollment or course offerings increase. In contrast, the Outreach Centers have a static funding level based on a specific staffing pattern. They can receive additional funds only after a new analysis of needs. The second and more crucial problem is the level of funding. For fall 1984, the average level of funding for the high schools was one unit for every 18.07 students. At that time, based on the number of students on register, the Outreach Centers received one unit for every 15.89 students. This is better than the average (the fewer students per unit, the richer the funding), but not as well-funded as some schools, which received up to one unit for every 14.61 students. However the registers at the Outreach Centers tend to increase during the year (unlike the registers of the regular high schools which tend to fall). Last year's register peaked in the spring (April 1984) at 2,154 students, versus 1,812 for the fall, demonstrating the Centers' success in attracting students. That increase brought the funding down to only one unit for every 18.89 students, considerably worse than the average. This funding is particularly inadequate considering the high needs of the Outreach Centers. It also does not reflect those students who receive one-time information and referral or short-term assessment and services. Although these services cost money, the students are not counted on the register.

Literacy Centers

In October 1982, as a result of the Youth Literacy Task Force, a joint project of the Mayor's Office and the Board of Education, two Literacy Centers were established in the school system: one in

the Bronx serving 120 students, and one in Brooklyn serving 148 students. The Literacy Centers concentrate upon those dropouts whose reading is below the 5th grade level. Students are offered four hours of instruction daily in small classes. When they began, the Literacy Centers received referrals from the Outreach Centers, which had been flooded by older students with minimum reading skills. If they were to succeed, these students could not be referred back to high school or to GED programs and many had already been at the Outreach Centers for a while. The Literacy Centers have quickly filled to capacity, and now attract many students through word-of-mouth. Linkages have been made with the Women's and Infants' Nutritional Program daycare programs for welfare mothers.

To a certain degree, the Outreach Centers and Literacy Centers have common problems. Both are seen as stepchildren to the system; they are not schools but rather alternative programs within the Division of High Schools. Until Literacy Centers are firmly established, they should be linked to the Outreach Centers where their work complements the Outreach Centers' efforts. The Board has begun a useful experiment to serve the most needy young people with the fewest options. The Literacy Centers fill an outstanding and pressing need; they should be encouraged and effectively linked with the whole spectrum of remedial services offered within the school system.

With the establishment of the Literacy Assistance Center (LAC) (see page 48), there is an obvious opportunity to encourage integration of the Literacy Centers and the school system. LAC's task is to provide technical assistance to literacy programs. But the

Board has not asked LAC to help the Literacy Centers. Rather LAC was asked to provide a high-school based in-service program. This is typical of the "stepchild" status of the alternative programs. Resources are first given to the traditional high school; alternatives are given less or ignored. In this case LAC can help integrate the staff of the Literacy Centers with staff in other programs.

B. CUNY: An Untapped Resource for Older Youth

CUNY has two major programs that address remediation needs; one for students with a high school diploma or its equivalent who have been accepted into CUNY; the second for adults without a high school diploma or equivalent. In both areas CUNY has been a leader in developing remediation technique, but the Board of Education has not used these approaches.

CUNY's Remedial Programs

CUNY has committed an increasing amount of its own resources to remediation because of the poor performance of incoming freshmen. As a response to a substantial number of entering freshmen who needed assistance in the basic skills areas (reading, writing, and mathematics), CUNY created the Instructional Research Center (IRC). In 1976, the Trustees broadened its mandate to conduct assessments of incoming freshmen so that a minimum competency level was established throughout the CUNY system. Since 1978 all students must take the Freshman Skills Assessment Program (FSAP) conducted by the IRC which tests them in three subjects: writing, reading and mathematics. Students who do not pass a subject must take non-credit

bearing basic skills course before continuing in the college. State funding supports unprepared students through the Supplemental Tuition Assistance Program (STAP). Currently, over 6,000 CUNY faculty and 60,000 students are involved in basic skills programs.

Since its inception, the IRC has collected and disseminated information about basic skills. The Center provides a forum for basic skills faculty within CUNY to share their education theories, achievements and concerns. In addition to conducting CUNY's Freshman Skills Assessment Program, the center directs nationwide research on basic skills development and provides expertise so institutions outside CUNY (other colleges or local school systems) can improve their teaching of basic skills. However its services are only rarely used by the Board of Education and then only on an ad hoc basis when a speaker is requested by a Board administrator.

Certainly CUNY is not the only university that has thousands of incoming students with a high school diploma or its equivalent unable to do college work. In a nationwide survey of 1,269 institutions conducted by IRC, 8 out of 10 universities had some courses in basic skills, although most have just begun to address the need. Because of its early start and strong leadership, CUNY is ahead of other universities in its expertise in basic skills teaching, in development of assessment tools to accurately test incoming students, and in the creation of materials and staff development to improve the quality of basic skills teaching.

CUNY's Remedial Adult Programs

While there are a number of college-based remedial courses for students with GEDs or diplomas, remedial courses and funds for such

courses for those without high school diplomas are scarcer. Support for programs for students before the GED or diploma stage has just begun to develop on a wider scale. CUNY Chancellor Joseph Murphy's first step in this area was the appointment of Dr. Augusta Kappner, who is highly respected in the field of continuing education, to the position of Dean of Adult Continuing Education within the Office of Academic Affairs. Dr. Kappner was Dean of Continuing Education at LaGuardia, a program known for its linkages to social and employment services for its students.

CUNY's Adult and Continuing Education Office has two problems: establishing the legitimacy of a university system's involvement in noncredit courses, particularly those remedial in nature; and finding ways to adequately finance such involvement. One has only to examine the enormous commitment and success some of the community colleges have had with basic skills, ESL and GED programs to know that colleges belong in this arena.

CUNY's Learning Centers

Several four-year and community colleges have established learning centers that service the community with a variety of non-credit courses. The York Learning Center is probably the best known of these centers in New York City, and there are other successful centers upstate.

The York Learning Center focuses on providing comprehensive learning opportunities to the Jamaica, Queens community around it. The Center raises over $2 million through a variety of grants, contracts and private support. York College provides the rent and utilities.

The model this Center has provided is of major importance to linking CUNY college to the needs of community residents who are in desperate need of all kinds of remedial programs. Students can attend beginning literacy classes and go through their GED program. With appropriate educational skills, students can then be helped in their job search.

This comprehensive model provides educational continuity and increased opportunities for employment to those in the greatest need. With the proper incentives, CUNY could create such learning centers at each of its community colleges.

Unfortunately the opposition is formidable. The State Education Department and the teachers' union have long held that colleges should not be involved in this type of remedial work. But the potential is enormous. York has provided opportunity in a low-income community where none existed before, and it has linked remedial skills programs to job training and other support programs. Ideally, such learning centers could be financed on a pilot basis by the state. Similar comprehensive learning centers that exist in other parts of the state all have major financing problems.

The centers use almost all their funds for direct instruction; little is available for labs and counseling. The importance of adult and continuing education is widely acknowledged, but there has been little movement toward providing adequate support. Pilot projects could be created throughout the state that would be comprehensive learning centers and provide the full range of services -- remedial coursework, support services, labs, job training, and

development. Such pilot programs need not be limited to higher education; rather both local school districts and institutions of higher learning can be involved.

Funding

CUNY finances adult and continuing education in one of two ways: either through the charging of a fee which allows the college to apply for a small amount of state aid, or through various grants from the limited sources of funding as described in the financing section of this report. CUNY permits colleges to pay the rent and utilities for adult and continuing education progrms.

One source of funding for CUNY is the federal Adult Education Act funds administered by the state. Four colleges receive AEA funds to offer education courses for those students not yet reading at the 8th grade level and hence not able to prepare for the GED exam. Three of the four colleges have a higher success rate than the Board's. The one college that does not have a high success rate concentrates upon serving an illiterate population, traditionally the most difficult to educate. In addition to the GED and basic skills levels, all four colleges receiving AEA funds offer an ESL component and all of these are more successful than the Board's ESL courses.

CUNY has lobbied to amend the High School Equivalency Act so that funds go directly to CUNY rather than to the Board for subcontracting. This request has fallen on deaf ears in Albany. Now that High School Equivalency funds are merged with the Employment Preparation Education funds, CUNY will ask for EPE funds to be distributed to colleges and CBOs as well as to school systems.

CUNY has few ties to the public school system which is the source of most of its students. The linkages that now exist are ad hoc, with individual principals and superintendents calling the Instructional Research Center for speakers. On occasion a conference provides some interaction between the teachers of the public school system and CUNY basic skills faculty. There are no formal linkages and no methods other than informal networking that permit the staffs of the two institutions to learn from one another.

The greatest barriers to networking are prejudice and money. Board of Education staff resent the lighter teaching loads and smaller classes of CUNY faculty. Remedial classes at CUNY usually contain about 20 students, while public school teachers have class sizes over 30. However, a more significant problem is the lack of money for the two institutions to share expertise. The Board of Education says it cannot afford to pay CUNY remedial faculty to teach high school teachers their methods; nor will it pay for teachers' time to attend CUNY seminars. And CUNY cannot be expected to fund staff training for the New York City public schools. At the current time, few dollars from either institution are going into staff development, let alone dollars to be shared with another institution. (The Literacy Assistance Center (p. 48) has the only experiment in joint staff development.)

Appropriate funding is the key to linking these two resources. In order to utilize CUNY's expertise, methods of financing a collaboration with the Board of Education must be found. One possibility would be to finance staff development as a joint project between

the two institutions. Another is to fund staff development for the Board, but set aside a certain percentage of the funds to be utilized by outside institutions of higher education. In any case, the staff training should be conducted by CUNY's basic skills staff, not instructors from the teacher education divisions. Before collaboration can begin, a structure including the financing, must be in place.

C. Community Based Organizations: Resources Awaiting Recognition

The State Education Department finances 24 organizations other than the Board of Education through the federal Adult Education program. Four of these organizations are colleges; the remainder are a variety of organizations with a history of commitment to teaching basic skills.

The community based organizations range in size from four classes in English as a Second Language to 10 classes in six week cycles offering a range of skills. The requirements for teachers also vary. Most programs require a Bachelor's degree; few require a Master's. The pay is usually between $16 and $20 an hour. Full time teachers may earn $20,000 a year. All programs stressed experience in teaching literacy over any other qualification for teachers.

The programs had hours that ranged from morning to night while most had at least an evening component. Instructional hours range from eight to 15 hours a week, with some full-time programs. Their curriculum was almost always their own. Some concentrated upon a life skills curriculum that stressed everyday needs. Others stressed a phonics approach in basic literacy.

All the programs had linkages with social service agencies and many had active contacts with job training programs. They frequently referred their students to an appropriate next step.

Not every CBO is successful. However, of the 24 organizations, 18 have a higher rate of success than the Board's. The CBOs attributed their success to several factors:

1. Small size - None of the organizations have more than 600 students for the year. All had class size of less than 20; two offered one-to-one tutorials.

2. Teacher selection - The organizations choose their own teachers and do not wish to use BOE teachers.

3. Curriculum - All have their own curriculum,; one organization uses the state's curriculum but augments it.

4. Commitment - Most are open at least 9 to 5, and almost all offer evening and summer courses.

The Board of Education and CBOs have little contact with each others. Few CBOs use Board teachers because they say the teachers' hours are inflexible and they will not use the CBOs' curricula.

Most of these CBOs were established through a now-defunct federal program, Basic Skills and Education Proficiency (1979 to 82). Financed by Title II and IX, Part B of the Educational Amendments of 1978, this national program funded nonschool agencies to teach basic skills. In its three years of operation, the Basic Skills program provided national leadership through extensive technical assistance and country-wide networking. While the program was known for its sophisticated technical assistance, community organization staff members identified other characteristics of the program that they appreciated: networking, strict evaluation and

flexibility in altering proposals and requesting budget modifications. When the funding was cut in 1982, the CBOs continued with funding from the federal ABE program administered by SED, although many had to reduce their program offerings.

A good example of a community-based organization that serves older youth with remedial skills programs is one serving over 1,200 people a year. (The program directors interviewed asked that their agencies remain unidentified.) Established over 24 years ago in the Yorkville area of Manhattan, this privately-funded organization places disadvantaged young people in private sector jobs. The students receive counseling services, educational services and job placement. This organization does not want any relationship with the Board of Education because they have developed their own curriculum and want the flexibility to use that curriculum. The organization also wants teachers who will work from 9 to 5 and therefore does not want to use Board of Education teachers.

Like many organizations, this one has established close ties with other agencies. It sends more than 40 clients a year to the Bank Street College Basic Skills program. In addition links have been created to local hospitals and clinics for clients who may need medical assistance.

Another CBO in the Bronx has achieved recognition within the city and state for its accomplishments in teaching the illiterate. There are few programs for the absolute nonreader. This CBO teaches only nonreaders and has developed a curriculum specifically designed for them. Once again, this CBO has no relationship with the Board of Education. The CBO wants to train its own teachers and use its

own curriculum, a curriculum that has been documented as highly successful.

Another CBO, operating with volunteers rather than paid staff as teachers, serves over 600 students a year throughout the city. A highly committed small central staff trains volunteers who work on a one-to-one basis with those in need of basic literacy training. This organization aggressively seeks private contributions, corporate and foundation funds. It has no formal links to the school sytem although the staff was hopeful that the establishment of the Literacy Assistance Center would be the catalyst to create more networking between the Board and CBOs.

Unfortunately, the current administration at the Board of Education has established a pattern of ignoring agencies that have demonstrated an ability to work with difficult students. For instance, the recent state funding for attendance improvement/dropout prevention has presented an opportunity to open the schools to a broader community. However, the High School Division has contracted with only one program, to eventually serve 12 high schools. Furthermore, this agency, Federation Employment and Guidance Services, which has operated a successful dropout prevention program, Operation Success, for several years, has had to agree to use Board of Education personnel (teachers or guidance counselors) as counselors for the first time this year in order to qualify for the new funds. According to program personnel, this will restrict some of the program's flexibility especially with regard to hours and the freedom to choose the most committed and enthusiastic staff. Although it may be unrelated, participation in the program has declined this year.

D. Literacy Assistance Center

The newly created Literacy Assistance Center (LAC) is an independent not-for-profit organization whose mission is to promote the expansion of effective literacy instruction for older youth (14+) and adults in New York City. The Center does not operate literacy programs. Instead, it fulfills its mission in two ways: first, by increasing the access of educational and social service agencies in the public and private sectors to the information, planning and training services that they need to serve non-literate youth; and second, by advocating increased allocations of public and private resources to literacy services.

The Center's primary targets for support are the major public institutions that provide literacy training: the Board of Education; the City University; and the public libraries.

The Center will be a clearinghouse for information on literacy issues and resources: literacy-oriented research, local program descriptions, instructional materials and techniques, and current information on funding sources and policies. The Center will provide a forum for the regular exchange of information among practitioners. It will respond to requests from public and private agencies for technical assistance. It will establish an information system and provide analysis of data collected on literacy.

The advent of LAC is important in the promotion and expansion of literacy services. Although it is too soon to judge LAC's success, its mission is essential.

E. JTPA: Turf Fighting Between Agencies

The Job Training Partnership Act (JTPA), a federal job training and employment program, began in October 1983. JTPA replaced CETA with the aim of greater private sector involvement and greater state involvement. Under JTPA, each state establishes a Job Training Coordinating Council, consisting of business representatives, state agencies and local governments, to plan, coordinate, and monitor the programs. New York is divided into service delivery areas each with its own Private Industry Council that works in partnership with local elected officials. While most of the funds are for job training and employment programs, in recognition of the fact that many untrained people also have need for academic remediation, eight percent of the JTPA funds in each state are earmarked for the teaching of basic skills. While JTPA was designed by the federal government, the state plays a leadership role in the allocation of funds. The state has allocated 78 percent of the funds to job training, but nothing prevents the state from using part of these funds to supplement the minimum eight percent set-aside for remedial education. The education component is particularly important for New York City, where most of the training programs are for clerical jobs which require high reading ability. In New York State, the State Education Department has the responsibility of administering the basic skills component. Since the state's Department of Labor controls the training funds and the state Education Department has control of the remedial funds, a close working relationship between the two agencies is needed.

The original design of this cooperation was that local education providers conduct basic skills programs and recruit their students from the trainees in the job training programs or recruit students who, when completing their remedial studies, would enter a JTPA job training program. This coordination between education and job training, while absolutely necessary, has never worked in practice as it was envisioned.

Of the almost 5,000 people that the education providers planned to enroll in the JTPA Basic Skills programs in 1984, approximately 2,300 actually participated, and fewer than half of these were youths. Late starts and difficulty recruiting account for most of the shortfall. The state has committed $2.9 million for FY 1985 and the Department plans to serve 3,000 youths this year.

The local education providers and the Department of Employment had a great deal of difficulty coordinating administration and program services. The first year of operation was, in the words of CBOs, "a disaster." Of the 24 organizations with a history of teaching basic skills, seven established JTPA 8% Basic Skills Programs. Those interviewed to date had the following observations:

1. There was conflict between the state Education Department and the local Department of Employment (DOE) so that every policy question was debated endlessly between the two agencies and often there was either no resolution or contradictory decisions. For example, a question arose on whether foreigners had to register for the draft. This was debated endlessly. Another was whether a recipient of food stamps could be in the 8% Basic Skills Program.

2. There was no coordination for referrals of students between the job training programs and the educational programs. Finally, in search of students, educational providers recruited their own clients, which resulted in conflicts with DOE about their eligibility.

3. Payments were hopelessly behind. The program began in October and the first payment wasn't received until January or February. The payments continued to be late, and education providers have difficulties paying their staffs.

4. Their harshest criticisms were reserved for DOE's maze of paperwork. All educational providers must make certain that their students are certified, i.e., meet all the eligibility requirements, to be in the JTPA program. While the paperwork is burdensome, what exacerbates the problem is that students must be recertified as they move from one program component to another. It is not enough to once prove that the student has registered for the draft, has a certain income, social security number, birth certificate, etc., it has to be proven more than once. This is a nightmare particularly for small programs that have few administrative staff. For example, when the Training Assessment and Placement (TAP) Centers refer students to the education programs, they first discharge them from the TAP Centers. If an educational provider wishes to have a TAP client in its program, all the paperwork must be reprocessed. As one CBO representative said, "It make no sense. We are drowning in a sea of paperwork."

5. DOE requires that training programs operate in six-month cycles, so the educational providers also have to operate in six-month cycles. This is educationally difficult, particularly if programs work with youth who are non-literate and must achieve an eighth grade reading level to qualify for job training programs.

The Basic Skills Providers have valid complaints, but many of their problems can be traced, not to DOE, but to the lack of coordination between the two state agencies and the lateness in the entire proposal process that SED established. This lateness has been repeated for the coming fiscal year. The request-for-proposal for July 1, 1984 to June 30, 1985 was issued in June 1984. There is no way that the Basic Skills Providers will be funded before the late fall even though the job training programs will have started at the beginning of the fiscal year.

When local DOE officials were asked about the complaints of the education providers, their response was that the State Education Department administers that program. DOE officials did state that they had agreed in principle that the recertification was not necessary but that changes had to be made in their information system before they could change the requirement. Most of the internal management problems should have been resolved. DOE has had a year to resolve the recertification issue that results in enormous paperwork for these educational programs.

The JTPA program has inadequate linkages between remedial education and work experience for older youth. A proposal by the Ford Foundation calls for a redesign of the Summer Youth Employment component of JTPA. This would provide intensive remedial education combined with work experience for entering high school students who have been identified as high risk. This proposal is based upon the recognition that summer jobs are a primary source of initial job experience and income for disadvantaged youth. At the same time, summer can be used to provide remediation for youth who need it and who risk the most from falling behind over the summer. If remedial education were combined with work experience during the summer for high risk youth, those youngsters would have an incentive to remain in school and to achieve academically. The national proposal calls for such a program for each successive summer for these students during their high school years. This type of program, if well planned, could provide major incentives for high-risk youth to remain in school, and could be a model for coordinating funding and services for disadvantaged youngsters.

VI. SERVICES FOR YOUNG STUDENTS

A. Truancy and Remediation

One of the first predictors of poor academic work is truancy. The more students miss school, the further behind they fall, until they eventually become so discouraged that leaving school seems to be the only reasonable alternative.

Truancy is a warning signal. This system has over 130,000 pupils absent on any given day. Over 78,000 are from the community school districts (of whom 9,000 are special education students), 52,000 are absent from the high schools and 4,500 are absent from special education citywide programs.

The inability of the school system to address the needs of the chronic truant is only too clear. Staffing is at a minimum. The central Bureau of Attendance has not had a director for years. In the early 70s, the central Bureau was restructured and decentralized its attendance functions to the 32 community school districts. Before the fiscal crisis, there were 351 attendance teachers and 31 supervisors in the districts. As a result of drastic funding cuts since 1976, there are 80 district attendance teachers, six supervisors and little clerical help. Eleven districts have only one attendance teacher each.

Of course, the lack of an attendance teacher is not necessarily an indication that attendance is being ignored. If the proper attendance plans were being drafted and implemented and if proper attendance procedures were being followed, there would be evidence that CSDs had found other means of dealing with attendance problems.

(In fact, the EPP has previously recommended differentiated staffing and contracting with outside agencies for dealing with attendance issues.) However, only two CSDs report statistical information regarding attendance staff to central, and some districts do not use the proper forms to report pupil absentees. The central Divisions of Special Education and High Schools fare no better. The central staff of attendance teachers in 1979 was 110. Today it is comprised of 92; only 75 of these assigned to the Divisions.

The first action the school system needs to take is to modify its information system to track and identify individual students. School officials could then establish policies that would address the individual student's needs. Modifications of the information system (known as OSIS) are minor since the data already exist at the classroom level. What is required is that school officials see truancy, particularly among younger students, as a problem that needs to be addressed. The clear intention of the Serrano attendance improvement legislation was that school systems identify and help chronic truants; this school system has not collected data at the district level or for individual students that would fulfill this need. However, as a result of a task force headed by the Public Education Association, a system to do this is scheduled for installation this spring.

The second action that needs to be taken is that programs emphasizing district-wide attendance need to be developed and resources must be given to these programs. The resources could be in the form of personnel (teachers, clerical help, paras) or in

the form of funds to link schools to community agencies that promote attendance.

The EPP has made the following recommendations: strict monitoring of school attendance plans should be implemented; community-based organizations should be contracted to provide outreach attendance services for high risk youth; and basic changes must be made in the information system. Another group, the School Attendance Coalition advocates a central monitoring and technical assistance unit as part of an overall plan to improve attendance.

The school system's response so far has been to reorganize the Bureau of Attendance once again. Proposing structural changes is not the answer. First, the Board of Education should focus upon an overall policy and agreement on program development, and only then make structural changes to fit an overall plan. Whether or not the Bureau of Attendance should be drastically altered is dependent upon the type of attendance program that works for students. Certainly administrative changes alone will not help.

The schools' unwillingness or inability to work with other agencies is demonstrated by their reaction to the Serrano-sponsored attendance improvement funding. Although one clear intent on of the Serrano legislation was to increase the involvement of community organizations in truancy programs, only two such joint programs have been launched at the district level: one between a district and a CBO, and one involving a district and a private university.

For younger students, there are only a few programs that seek to address the lack of basic skills beyond the normal remedial classes. Classes financed by state PSEN funds address only one

problem, poor reading, without addressing the problems that have led to the need for remedial skills and without seeking less traditional methods or settings. Unlike programs for older youth, there is little financing and consequently little expansion of alternative programs that do make a difference in students' lives.

B. School Volunteer Program

One of the largest remedial programs and the one involving the largest number of outside people is a volunteer program called the New York City School Volunteer Program (SVP). In the program, which is sponsored by the Board of Education and receives private contributions, local residents tutor children in the schools in a volunteer capacity. SVP has over 27,000 volunteers, of whom approximately 7,500 are tutors, helping 61,000 students in need of remediation. Research has shown that strong personal one-to-one relationships are a major factor in school motivation. In addition to tutorial services, SVP is now offering two special projects: one in career education and mentoring at Park West High School; and the other in early intervention. While the Volunteer Program does not limit itself to younger students, the majority of the volunteers work with younger students. SVP is one of the oldest tutorial programs in the country - 29 years. The SVP has conducted its own evaluations and found that in a sample of youngsters (7,652) tested, over 53% made gains of at least one year. An in-depth evaluation of all the students as well as a longitudinal study of the students served in this program would be useful in evaluating this program.

With the advent of its new programs, SVP is starting to consider a more comprehensive program for students, rather than simply tutoring. This is very desirable, since the proven techniques for high-risk youngsters in elementary and junior high schools all involve a multi-faceted approach. All in all, the School Volunteer Program makes a valuable contribution to remedial education.

The model programs presented below illustrate other approaches, all multi-faceted. They are only three of many that exist in the city, each one uniquely tied to its particular client and community needs. (City agencies, including the Youth Board and the Community Development agency, contract with many community organizations that conduct remedial and tutoring programs.) <u>They illustrate that school-community linkages lead to comprehensive programs and that such programs are limited only by the reluctance of some school officials.</u>

C. <u>Three Examples of Remedial Programs that Make a Difference</u>

Students in elementary and junior high school do not have as many alternative remedial programs to choose from as do high school students. Unfortunately, there are few alternative programs for younger students. However, of those that do exist, many have had excellent results with this age group. These programs divide into full-time school programs and after-school programs.

One of the best full-time remedial programs for young people is Grand Academy. Grand Academy was initiated in 1982-83 as a collaborative effort between Community School District #1 and Grand Street Settlement. The program was established at the settlement

house in an effort to remove students from the traditional school environment where they constantly experienced failure and to tie the school program to the community close by. The program has two components, instructional and supportive, offered in an integrated and complementary fashion. CSD 1 provides the teachers, while Grand Street Settlement is under contract with CSD 1 to provide the social work, vocational guidance and after-school services. CSD 1 paid $85,000 to Grand Street Settlement in the first year of the academy to provide these services. The personnel function as a team regardless of their component.

Grand Academy served 30 fifth grade and 60 eighth grade "Gates Extension" (double holdover) students in 1983-84. The students received a year of intensive instruction in classes of 15 in the basic skills. In addition, there is a full program which includes academic subjects and the arts. The students also receive extensive support systems - outreach and home visits to youngsters who miss school, personal and family counseling for problems which interfere with school performance, an after-school program, and an introductory vocational preparation program.

The Grand Academy had significant success with a difficult population in both attendance and reading:

Average Daily Attendance	Pre-Program 1981-82	During Program Fall 83 Semester
Categories	% Students	% Students
80-100%	49.3%	74.3%
60-79	30.9	17.1
Below 60%	19.8	8.6
Total	100.0%	100.0%

Replication of a community/school collaboration model need not be difficult. What is needed is technical assistance and seed money. School officials who have such expertise can provide that expertise to other districts. If seed money were made available through a central fund, then that technical assistance could be forthcoming. But school officials must be willing to experiment with small alternative programs.

Another area ripe for joint efforts is after-school programs. Although there are many after-school programs throughout the city, in general school buildings are substantially under-utilized during non-school hours. Usually funded by Youth Bureau funds, after-school centers provide assistance in homework, instruction in arts and physical education. The Youth Bureau funds have become a major source of funding that keeps the schools open after 3 p.m. and thus offers opportunities to link the schools to communities in many ways. While many programs, of varying quality exist, one is highlighted here, chosen because of its comprehensiveness to represent the excellent models throughout the city.

The Center for Family Life in Sunset Park was begun in 1978 as a neighborhood program with comprehensive services for all families in the neighborhood. It has as its goal direct services for families in all facets of their lives, including education and employment. Its activities are extensive and thoughtful:

1. Seven-day-a-week availability to people in the community;
2. Comprehensive assessment, evaluation and counseling services.

3. Linking individuals and families to community agencies such as medical, legal, vocational agencies;

4. Sponsorship of an Advocacy Clinic to assist families in housing needs, etc.;

5. Community school projects at P.S. 1, P.S. 172, and P.S. 94 in Sunset Park to link parents with the school so that the crucial link between the school and student work;

6. Job counseling, job search and job placement for all people over 16 years of age.

These are only some of the many services provided by this organization in Sunset Park. One of its central themes is that the school is a major force in effecting development of the entire community. At P.S. 1 both family programs and after-school centers are offered. The after-school center focuses on tutoring those students who need help. At P.S. 94, a partnership was created among school administrators, staff, parents and community agencies. Community Planning Board 7 has established a Human Services Cabinet Truancy Committee made up of public and voluntary organizations in Sunset Park. While the program is new, children's truancy at P.S. 94 is decreasing. This type of program provides ample linkages between schools and the resources in the community. The resistance to such programs, according to several people in the schools and in the CBO, lies in school officials' fears of losing control.

Another program with comprehensive services to high risk youth is the Rheedlen Foundation. The major programs are the Truancy Prevention Program, located at Rheedlen's headquarters, and Center 54, an after-school program at JHS 54. Richard Murphy, Director of Rheedlen, makes a close connection between truancy and school failure and delinquency. The earlier truants are identified, the more successful can

be the preventive program. The programs serve truants ages 6 to 12 in a highly structured academic and social atmosphere.

The cost of renting the space at JHS 54 for 32 weeks, 18 hours a week, is $17,000, mainly for custodial fees. After-school programs spend much of their Youth Bureau funds on custodial fees. The daily custodial fee for an afternoon session is $34.60. The Youth Bureau has a $4.7 million budget for after-school programs, $500,000 of which is paid to keep schools open from 3 to 5. The Youth Bureau used to pay close to a $1 million to keep the schools open in the evening at a higher rate but, because of the expense, now concentrates upon afternoon programs.

In order for after-school programs to exist, the schools need to be open at reasonable or no cost to CBOs. The most costly problem after-school programs face is opening schools. Funds needed for program must be invested in renting the school space. The most convenient and best facilities for students are schools. As Murphy said, said, "Schools are the only good space in poor neighborhoods, they're heated, they're built to take kids. But the rent is exorbitant." As a result, direct services are limited.

Joint efforts between communities and schools can work only if the Board sets a strong policy to that effect and seeks appropriate funding. Welcoming community groups into the schools and reducing custodial fees through negotiation with the union, increasing district allocations to encourage experimentation, using differentiated staffing patterns in non-traditional settings -- all would make collaboration easier and more effective and would facilitate the replication of successful programs.

VII. CONCLUSION

The picture painted in this report is one of a wealth of resources, at least in talent and creative thinking if not necessarily in money, that exists in New York City, especially with regard to older youths. However, it is also one of isolationism and fierce territorial protectionism. The Board of Education is reluctant to share students (i.e., money) with community organizations or other institutions. Even under its own auspices, there are constraints upon the free flow of students to alternative settings. This "bunker mentality" is enforced in Albany, where struggles are played out to retain power within traditional professional and institutional organizations.

Yet students who cannot keep pace often feel alienated by exactly those traditional frameworks, as evidenced by the profound statement of rejection they make when they drop out.

It is important to note that the public schools can and have served the needs of the vast majority of their students. However, all the literature points to the conclusion that, for some high-risk students, a greater variety of individually-tailored approaches and supports must be brought to bear. In some cases, the school system can provide these and it should make every effort to do so by incorporating the methods used in alternative settings. In other cases, closer coordination with outside agencies is the best way of providing these services. Regardless of the provider, the primary goal is that channels be opened so that students have free and full access to the variety of services that New York City can offer.

APPENDIX - A

Literacy Programs Sponsored by Federal AEA Program

Agudath Israel of America (Agudath)
5 Beekman Street
New York, NY 10038

Armenian General Benevolent Union (Armengen)
39-11 61st Street
Woodside, NY 1377

Associated YM-YWHAs (Assocy's)
3300 Coney Island Avenue
Brooklyn, NY 11235

BHRAGS, Inc. (Bhrags)
1212 E. NY Avenue
Brooklyn, NY 11212

Bronx Community College (BronxCol)
181 Street & University Avenue
Gould Hall, Rm 417
Bronx, NY 10463

Bronx Educational Services, Inc. (Ed Ser).
3422 Bailey Place
Bronx, NY 10463

Centra Educacional Caribe
260 Audubon Avenue
New York, NY 10033

Forest Hills Adult Center
67-01 110th Street
Forest Hills, NY 11375

Fortune Society (Fortun)
229 Park Avenue South
New York, NY 10003

HANAC, Inc.
15 Park Row
New York, NY 10038

Joseph Bulova School
40-24 62nd Avenue
Woodside, NY 11377

LaGuardia Community College
31-10 Thomson Avenue
Long Island City, NY 11101

Literacy Volunteers of NYC
270 West 70th Street
New York, NY 10023

Local 237, Teamsters Union
216 West 14th Street
New York, NY 11561

Malcolm King: Harlem College Extension
2090 Adam Clayton Powell Blvd.
New York, NY 10027

NYC Board of Education
347 Baltic Street
Brooklyn, NY 11201

New York City Technical College (NYCTech)
300 Jay Street
Brooklyn, NY 11201

PROMESA
1776 Clay Avenue
Bronx, NY 10457

Queens Public Library
89-11 Merrick Blvd.
Jamaica, NY 11432

Riverside Adult Learning Center (Riversid)
Riverside Church
490 Riverside Drive
New York, NY 10027

Solidaridad Humana (Humana)
107 Suffolk Street
New York, NY 100(?

Sunset Park Family Health Center (SunsetPk)
150 55th Street
Brooklyn, NY 11220

York College
150-14 Jamaica Avenue
Jamaica, NY 11451

I. SED, AEA, ESL DATA IN RANK ORDER BY % STS. COMPLETE

PROGRAM	RANK	ESL	ESL: COMP.	%STS. COMP.
CCEC	1	51	40	78.43
LAGUARDI	2	52	40	76.92
HANAC	3	103	72	69.90
RIVERSID	4	361	250	69.25
SUNSETPK	5	121	83	68.60
JOSBUL	6	8	5	62.50
PROJCALL	7	156	97	62.18
YORK	8	308	189	61.36
QUEENSLIB	9	39	23	58.97
BRONXCOL	10	120	67	55.83
ARMENGEN	11	58	30	51.72
AGUDATH	12	276	141	51.09
HUMANA	13	343	165	48.10
NYCTECH	14	146	69	47.26
ASSOCY'S	15	301	128	42.52
BE	16	6561	2604	39.69
PROMESA	17	63	24	38.10
BHRAGS	18	179	27	15.08
Total		9246	4054	43.85

II. SED, AEA DATA (Beginning Literacy 0-4.9 Grade Level)

PROGRAM	RANK	ABE 0-4.9	ABE: 4.9C	ABE:.%C
FORSTHIL	1	164	133	81.10
QUEENSLIB	2	4	3	75.00
CCEC	3	40	29	72.50
SUNSETPK	4	25	18	72.00
PROJCALL	5	61	42	68.85
ED SER	6	87	53	60.92
FORTUN	7	76	39	51.32
LAGUARDI	8	56	28	50.00
YORK	9	91	40	43.96
OASIS	10	37	16	43.24
MALKING	11	49	21	42.86
HUMANA	12	141	57	40.43
BRONXCOL	13	36	14	38.89
LOCAL 231	14	96	34	35.42
JOSBUL	15	9	3	33.33
BHRAGS	16	104	32	30.77
BE	17	1825	545	29.86
PROMESA	18	111	30	27.03
NYCTECH	19	203	40	19.70
Total		3215	1178	36.64

III. SED, AEA DATA (Literacy Middle Level 5-8.9)

PROGRAM	RANK	ABE 5-8.9	ABE: 8.9C	ABE:.%8.9C
FORSTHIL	1	110	.65	59.09
CCEC	2	23	12	52.17
LAGUARDI	3	283	121	42.76
FORTUN	4	69	26	37.68
SUNSETPK	5	45	16	35.56
JOSBUL	6	20	6	30.00
LOCAL 231	7	187	53	28.34
PROMESA	8	107	30	28.04
BE	9	10583	2957	27.94
YORK	10	102	28	27.45
BRONXCOL	11	30	8	26.67
NYCTECH	12	102	15	14.71
OASIS	13	113	15	13.27
MALKING	14	72	9	12.50
QUEENSLIB	15	10	1	10.00
PROJCALL	16	128	12	9.38
HUMANA	17	19	0	0.00
BHRAGS	18	7	0	0.00
Total		12010	3374	28.09

APPENDIX - B

Adult Literacy MAC/AEA Programs

Agency

Agudath Israel of America
5 Beekman Street
New York, NY 10038

American Reading Council
20 West 40th Street
New York, NY 10018

Associated YM-YWHAs of
Greater New York
3300 Coney Island Avenue
Brooklyn, NY 11235

Bedford Stuyvesant Restoration
Corporation
1368 Fulton Street
Brooklyn, NY 11216

BHRAGS, Inc.
1212 East New York Avenue
Brooklyn, NY 11212

Board of Education
Office of Adult & Continuing
Education
110 Livingston Street
Brooklyn, NY 11201

Bronx Community College
Division of Continuing Education
181 St. & University Avenue
Bronx, NY 10453

Bronx Educational Services
3422 Bailey Place
Bronx, NY 10463

Brooklyn Public Library
Grand Army Plaza
Brooklyn, NY 11238

Joseph Bulova School
40-24 62nd Avenue
Woodside, NY 11377

* Source: Literacy Assistance Center

YUS-2/5

Agency

Centro Educational Caribe
260 Audubon Avenue
New York, NY 10033

Chinatown Planning Council
13 Elizabeth Street
New York, NY 10013

Church Avenue Merchants
Block Association
474 Rugby Road
Brooklyn, NY 11226

City College of New York
Division of Continuing Education
Convent Avenue & 138th Street
New York, NY 10031

College of Staten Island
Division of Continuing Education
715 Ocean Terrace
Staten Island, NY 10301

Community Services Society
of New York
105 East 22 Street
New York, NY 10010

District Council 37
125 Barclay Street
New York, NY 10007

The Door
618 Avenue of the Americas
New York, NY 10011

Fortune Society
39 West 19th Street
New York, NY 10011

Good Shepherd Services
Family Reception Center
441 Fourth Avenue
Brooklyn, NY 11215

Haitian Centers Council
50 Court Street
Brooklyn, NY 11210

Agency

Hellenic American Neighborhood
Action Committee
31-14 30th Avenue
Astoria, NY 11102

Highbridge Community Life
Center, Inc.
75 West 168th Street
Bronx, NY 10452

Hostos Community College
Division of Continuing Education
475 Grand Concourse
Bronx, NY 10451

Jobs for Youth, Inc.
1831 Second Avenue
New York, NY 10128

Kingsborough Community College
Division of Continuing Education
2001 Oriental Blvd.
Brooklyn, NY 11235

LaGuardia Community College
Division of Continuing Education
31-10 Thomson Avenue
Long Island City, NY 11101

Herbert H. Lehman College
Institute for the Study & Promotion
of Literacy
Bedford Park Blvd. West
Bronx, NY 10468

Literacy Volunteers of
New York City, Inc.
270 West 70th Street
New York, NY 10023

Malcom King College
2090 Adam C. Powell Blvd.
New York, NY 10027

Manhattan Community College, Borough
of Division of Continuing Ed.
199 Chambers Street
New York, NY 10007

NAACP Project Rebound
270 West 96th Street
New York, NY 10025

Agency

National Congress of
Neighborhood Women
249 Manhattan Avenue
Brooklyn, NY 11211

New York City Technical College
Adult Learning Center
300 Jay Street
Brooklyn, NY 11201

New York Public Library
St. Agnes Library
444 Amsterdam Avenue
New York, NY 10024

New York Urban League
1500 Broadway
New York, NY 10036

Non-Traditional Employment for Women
105 East 22nd Street - Room 710
New York, NY 10010

PROMESA, Inc.
1776 Clay Avenue
Bronx, NY 10457

Queens Borough Public Library
89-11 Merrick Blvd.
Jamaica, NY 11432

Queens College
Department of Linguistics
65-30 Kissena Blvd.
Flushing, NY 11367

Riverside Adult Learning Center
490 Riverside Drive
New York, NY 10027

St. Rita's Inc.
Adult Learning Center
275 Shepherd Avenue
Brooklyn, NY 11208

Shaarei Zion
1475 47th Street
Brooklyn, NY 11219

Agency

Solidaridad Humana
107 Suffolk Street
New York, NY 11219

Sunset Park Family Health
Center of Lutheran Medical
150 55th Street - Room 2417
Brooklyn, NY 11220

Teamsters, Local 237
216 West 14th Street
New York, NY 10011

Touro College School of
General Studies
30 West 44th Street
New York, NY 10036

The Union Settlement
Association, Inc.
237 East 104th Street
New York, NY 10029

United Bronx Parents, Inc.
773 Prospect Avenue
Bronx, NY 10455

York College
York College Learning Center
90-40 150th Street
Jamaica, NY 11451

YMCA Elesar Project
215 West 23rd Street
New York, NY 10011